UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,285	10/14/2003	Markus Lauff	13909-117001 / 2003P00693	4913

32864 7590 04/04/2008
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/685,285	**Applicant(s)** LAUFF, MARKUS	
	Examiner Steven P. Sax	**Art Unit** 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 January 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The RCE and amendment filed 1/31/08 have been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al (2004/0165012) and Vale (2005/0022140).

4. Regarding claim 1, Nelson et al show a method comprising:
generating a one-dimensional navigation structure for an organization of information (abstract, para 10), the navigation structure comprising a plurality of elements, each element representing a portion of information (Figure 2, 3, 4); detecting a command indicating selection of one of the elements in the navigation structure and determining whether the selected element has at least one associated element (para 17, 19, Nelson et al show the concept of cascading menu); and if the selected element has at least one associated element, modifying the navigation structure by deleting the non-selected elements from the navigation structure and adding the elements associated with the selected element to the navigation structure (para 17, 19, 23). Nelson et al do not go

into the details of visually presenting information in a compact display space, with the method thereby conserving the display space while continuing to represent the information organization, but do mention efficiently presenting information in a variety of display space types. Furthermore, Vale does show visually presenting information in a compact display space, with the method thereby conserving the display space while continuing to represent the information organization, for efficient presentation in a variety of display space types (Figures 2, 6, para 10, 25, 36, 47, 48). Vale also brings out how the compact display is very common and typical for many devices. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Nelson et al, because it would provide an efficient way to present information in a typical and common display type.

5. Regarding claim 2, Nelson et al show generating a one-dimensional navigation structure for an organization of information comprises generating a user interface comprising a navigation portion, the navigation portion comprising the elements (see again Figures 2-4, para 10).

6. Regarding claim 3, Nelson et al show deleting the non-selected elements and adding the elements associated with the selected element comprises placing at least part of one of the associated elements in navigation portion space that was occupied by one of the non-selected elements or the selected element (para 17, 19, 20 – this is what

happens when the offset is small and the associated elements overlap or almost essentially replace the non-selected elements).

7. Regarding claim 4, the navigation portion comprises a horizontal navigation bar (Nelson et al - note horizontal motion to navigate to the associated elements, Figures 3, 4, para 20).

8. Regarding claim 5, the user interface comprises a graphical user interface (again Nelson et al para 10, Figures 2-4).

9. Regarding claim 6, Nelson et al show altering the presentation of the selected element so that the element is presented dissimilarly to the added elements (this is accomplished through the highlighting, see Nelson et al Figure 4, para 20, 21 for example).

10. Regarding claim 7, adding the elements associated with the selected element comprises appending the associated elements to the selected element (Nelson et al Figures 3, 4, para 16, 24).

11. Regarding claim 8, Nelson et al show performing a function or presenting data represented by the selected element if the selected element does not have at least

one associated element (para 22).

12. Regarding claim 9, Nelson et al show detecting a command indicating selection of one of the added elements in the navigation structure, determining whether the selected added element has at least one associated element, and if the selected added element has at least one associated element, modifying the navigation structure by deleting the non-selected added elements from the navigation structure and adding the elements associated with the selected added element to the navigation structure (para 19, 24, 25, consider the offset being 0% for example).

13. Regarding claim 10, Nelson et al show altering the presentation of the selected added element in the navigation structure so that the element is presented dissimilarly to the added elements (again note the highlighting, Figure 4, para 20, 21).

14. Regarding claim 11, Nelson et al show detecting a command indicating selection of a previously selected element in the navigation structure and modifying the navigation structure by deleting elements added after the selected previously selected element from the navigation structure and adding elements associated with the selected previously selected element to the navigation structure (para 19, 24, 25, consider here too the offset being 0% for example).

15. Claims 12-13, 15-20 show the same features as claims 1-3, 6, 8-11 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons.

16. Regarding claim 14, Nelson et al show the display device coupled to the processor, the display device operable to visually present the navigation structure; and a user input device coupled to the processor, the user input device operable to detect the command indicating selection of one of the elements (para 2, 3, Figures 2-4).

17. Claims 21-28 show the same features as claims 1-3, 6, 8-11 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons.

18. Claims 29-35 show the same features as claims 1, 6, 3, 8-11 respectively ,and are rejected for the same reasons.

19. Regarding claim 36, in addition to that mentioned for claim 1, Nelson et al show that the associated elements are a second level within the hierarchy (para 17, 19, 24 for example).

20. Regarding claim 37, in addition to that mentioned for claim 36, this shows the same features as claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons as those for claim 36 and claim 8 combined.

21. Regarding claim 38, in addition to that mentioned for claim 36, Nelson et al show the third and multiple levels of hierarchy (para 24, 25).

22. Regarding claim 39, in addition to that mentioned for claim 36, this shows the same features as claim 6 and is rejected for the same reasons as those for claim 36 and claim 6 combined.

23. Regarding claim 40, in addition to that mentioned for claim 36, this shows the same features as claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons as those for claim 36 and claim 9 combined.

24. Claim 41 shows the same features as claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11 combined, and is rejected for the same reasons as for those claims combined.

25. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P. Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P Sax/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

*